

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/648,140	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6611	3247	
5073 BAKER BOTT	7590 08/13/200 FS L.L.P.	EXAMINER			
2001 ROSS AT SUITE 600		LEWIS, ALICIA M			
DALLAS, TX	75201-2980		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2164		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/13/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

nt(s)	Applicant(s)	Application No.	
Y ET AL.	HARVEY ET AL.	10/648,140	
	Art Unit	Examiner	
	2164	Alicia M. Lewis	
	Art Unit	Examiner	

	Alicia M. Lewis	2164	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE	
\times The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following in application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: X	the same day as filing a Notice of a eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07().		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data- have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s est forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or 			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. If or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
/Charles Rones/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164			

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Shiman fails to teach "defining attribute of a specific type which correspond to a specific object class, each attribute unique to the specific object class to which the attribute belongs" Examiner disagrees. Shiman teaches that an object class is a type of object comprised of certain attributes, and that objects are manifestations of object classes defined by the value of their attributes. He further teaches that an object is indexed by the value of the primary key attribute. Applicant argues that the primary key is unique for the object and not the object class. However, it is well known in the art that a primary key attribute uniquely identifies an object class. The VALUE of the primary key attribute (i.e. red hair) uniquely identifies a specific object (i.e., a person named John), while the actual primary key attribute (i.e. hair color) uniquely identifies the object class (i.e., people). Therefore, Shiman does teach the above limitation.

Applicant also argues that Shiman does not teach that object classes are a subclass of an abstract object class. Examiner disagrees. Shiman teaches that classes are abstract, specifying a type of object that may be created, and that objects are abstract object disagrees. Shiman teaches that classes are abstract, specifying a type of object that may be created, and that objects are abstract object class. Thus, it is clear that object classes may be thought of as subclasses of an abstract object class.

Lastly, Applicant argues that Shiman does not teach "providing specific attributes which relate to one object class for a purpose of enhancing searching. Examiner disagrees. Shiman teaches that specific attributes, such as primary keys, are used to index object classes. He further teaches that the use of databases for search and retrieval. Therefore, the attributes are used for enhanced searching. Examiner would also like to point out that the intended use of an element (i.e. the specific attributes) does not necessarily limit the claim.